

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated February 10, 2006, (hereinafter, the "Action"), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

A review of the claims indicates that:

Claims 1-11, 13-16, 21-24, 26-27, and 29-38 were previously pending.

No claims are currently amended.

No claims are currently cancelled.

Claims 6, 27, and 29 remain in their original form.

Claims 12, 17-20, 25, and 28 have been previously cancelled.

Claims 1-11, 13-16, 21-24, 26-27, and 29-38 remain pending.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-11, 13-16, 21-24, 26-27, and 29-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,848,132 to Morley (hereinafter "Morley") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,578 to Brennan et al. (hereinafter "Brennan") and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,079 to Crockett et al. (hereinafter "Crockett"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

**Claim 1**

Turning first to **independent Claim 1**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and without conceding that Morley, Brennan, or Crockett provide the teaching for which they were cited in the Action, the Applicant submits the following remarks traversing the rejection. For convenience of discussion, the Applicant reproduces here portions of claim 1:

**Independent claim 1** defines a system to schedule placement of outgoing calls including:

“...

a service node (SN) that is adapted to communicate with the service switching point (SSP), wherein said service node (SN) is further adapted to place the outgoing call to at least one other telephone station from the first telephone station in accordance with said call schedule information; and

a service control point (SCP) adapted to communicate with said service switching point (SSP), and comprising: an administrative computing application, a call scheduling application, and a call information database, said service control point (SCP) configured to identify said service node (SN) as adapted to place the outgoing call to the other telephone station from the first telephone station in accordance with said call schedule information, wherein said service control point (SCP) and said service node (SN) are configured to place a confirmation call to an alternate telephone station specified by said scheduling party.”

Turning to the cited art, Morley describes in general a telecommunications network having resident ability to pre-book scheduled call back services, or automated call booking. Brennan describes in general a personal communications service with mobility manager. Applicant agrees with the Office's assessments that “Morley does not specifically teach said service control point (SCP) and said service node (SN) place a confirmation call to an alternate telephone station associated with said scheduling party” (Action, page 3), and “[t]he combination of

1 Morley and Brennan does not teach placement of outgoing calls and more  
2 specifically it does not teach the SN is actually adapted to place the outgoing calls”  
3 (Action, page 4).

4       Turning to Crockett, the Office cites Crockett as providing the missing  
5 teachings of Morley and Brennan stating Crockett teaches the “SN places outgoing  
6 telephone calls to [a] telephone station” (Action, page 4). Crockett discloses in  
7 general a method and system for providing enhanced call waiting. Without  
8 conceding that Morley, Brennan, and Crockett provide the teaching they are cited  
9 for in the Action, the Applicant submits that Crockett fails to remedy the  
10 shortcomings of Morley and Brennan.

11       Addressing Crockett in further detail, without intending undue emphasis on  
12 any portion of Crockett, Crockett describes a method for providing enhanced call  
13 waiting to a called party that is busy on a first call and receives a second call  
14 (Crockett, Abstract). The second call is recorded and played back to the called  
15 party when the first call ends, without interruption of the first call (Crockett,  
16 Abstract). Crockett does not teach or suggest “wherein said service node (SN) is  
17 further adapted to place the outgoing call to at least one other telephone station  
18 from the first telephone station in accordance with said call schedule information,”  
19 as in Applicant’s claim 1. Instead, Crockett describes an SN that periodically  
20 places outgoing calls to the number of the called party with the purpose of  
21 determining whether the first call has been terminated (Crockett, Col. 6, lines 4-  
22 11). These calls are not pre-scheduled calls, but are calls repeatedly placed until  
23 the called party answers and the recorded information of the second call may be  
24  
25

1 transmitted (Crockett, Col. 6, lines 5-9). This periodic placement of outgoing calls  
2 to a called party in Crockett does not teach the placement of outgoing calls in  
3 accordance with a previously arranged call schedule, as in Applicant's claim 1.

4 Additionally, Applicant's claim 1 recites a "...service node (SN)...adapted  
5 to place the outgoing call to the other telephone station from the first telephone  
6 station in accordance with said call schedule information, wherein said service  
7 control point (SCP) and said service node (SN) are configured to place a  
8 confirmation call to an alternate telephone station specified by said scheduling  
9 party." In contrast, Crockett teaches the repeated placement of outgoing calls to  
10 the originally called party until the called number is answered (Crockett, Col. 6,  
11 lines 5-9). Crockett does not teach or suggest at least the above feature recited in  
12 Applicant's claim 1.

13 Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits Crockett does not  
14 supply the missing teachings of Morley and Brennan and respectfully requests  
15 reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 1.

16  
17 Claims 2-11, 13-15, and 35-37 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1  
18 and stand rejected on similar grounds. Applicant respectfully submits the  
19 comments directed above apply equally to dependent claims 2-11, 13-15, and 35-  
20 37, and therefore are also allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to  
21 claim 1 as well as for the additional features they recite.

## 22 **Claim 16**

23 Turning to **independent Claim 16**, the Office rejects claim 16 for the same  
24 reasons as cited for claim 1. The comments directed above, traversing the Office's  
25

1 §103 rejection of claim 1, apply equally to claim 16. For at least those reasons,  
2 Applicant requests reconsideration of claim 16 and withdrawal of the §103  
3 rejection.

4 Claims 21-24 depend directly or indirectly from claim 16 and are allowable  
5 due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
6 allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in  
7 claim 16, are not taught by the combination of the Morley, Brennan, and Crockett  
8 patents.

#### 10 **Claim 26**

11 Turning to **independent Claim 26**, the Office rejects claim 26 for the same  
12 reasons as cited for claim 1. The comments directed above in regards to claim 1,  
13 traversing the Office's §103 rejection of claim, apply equally to claim 26. At least  
14 on that basis, Applicant requests reconsideration of claim 26 and withdrawal of the  
15 §103 rejection.

16 Claims 27 and 29 depend directly or indirectly from claim 26 and are  
17 allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are  
18 also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those  
19 recited in claim 26, are not taught by the combination of the Morley, Brennan, and  
20 Crockett patents.

#### 22 **Claim 30**

23 Turning to **independent claim 30**, without conceding the propriety of the  
24 stated rejection, and without conceding that Morley, Brennan, or Crockett provide  
25

1 the teaching for which they were cited in the Action, the Applicant submits  
2 Morley, Brennan, or Crockett do not teach or suggest every element of claim 30  
3 for similar reasons as described above for claim 1. For convenience of discussion,  
4 the Applicant reproduces here portions of claim 30:

5  
6 "...a telephone station for receiving call scheduling information as  
7 input by the scheduling party, wherein the call scheduling information  
8 includes at least data representing a telephone station to which a  
9 confirmation call related to the outgoing telephone call is to be placed;

10 a service control point (SCP) in communication with said telephone  
11 station, said service control point (SCP) for storing said call schedule  
12 information, and wherein said SCP and a service node (SN) are adapted to  
13 place the confirmation call to the telephone station, wherein the telephone  
14 station to which the confirmation call is to be placed is identified by said  
15 scheduling party..."

16  
17 Turning to Crockett, and without intending undue emphasis on any portion  
18 of Crockett, Applicant submits Crockett does not teach "a telephone station for  
19 receiving call scheduling information as input by the scheduling party, wherein the  
20 call scheduling information includes at least data representing a telephone station  
21 to which a confirmation call related to the outgoing telephone call is to be  
22 placed...and [a] service node (SN)...adapted to place the confirmation call to the  
23 telephone station, wherein the telephone station to which the confirmation call is  
24 to be placed is identified by said scheduling party..." as in Applicant's claim 30.  
25 Instead, Crockett teaches the repeated placement of outgoing calls to the originally  
called party until the called number is answered (Crockett, Col. 6, lines 5-9).  
Crockett does not teach the placement of scheduled calls to a telephone station  
previously requested by a scheduling party, as in Applicant's claim 30.

1       Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits Crockett does not  
2 supply the missing teachings of Morley and Brennan and respectfully requests  
3 reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 30.

4       Claims 31-34 depend from claim 30 and are allowable due to their  
5 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for  
6 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 30, are  
7 not taught by the combination of the Morley, Brennan, and Crockett patents.

8  
9  
10    **Claim 38**

11       Turning to **independent Claim 38**, the Office rejects claim 38 for the same  
12 reasons as cited for claim 1. The comments directed above in regards to claim 1,  
13 traversing the Office's §103 rejection of claim 1, apply equally to claim 38. At  
14 least on that basis, Applicant requests reconsideration of claim 38 and withdrawal  
15 of the §103 rejection.

**Conclusion**

The Applicant submits that all of the remaining claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 24 APR 06

By: 

Rocco L. Adornato  
Reg. No. 40,480  
(509) 324-9256 x 257  
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES, PLLC  
Suite 500  
421 W. Riverside Avenue  
Spokane, Washington 99201  
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979